

Response to Committee Questions and Requests from the December 12th Meeting

Prepared by Jon Heinrich

- The committee would like an opportunity for comment on technical briefs prepared by the Technical Advisory Group.

The TAG is incorporating into their work schedule this opportunity for committee members to review and comment on their draft technical briefs. A TAG work schedule is being prepared and will be made available to the CAC before their January 18th meeting.

- High priority technical briefs should be brought to the CAC for discussion.

The TAG is prepared to do this. By the January 18th CAC meeting a draft Environmental Assessment Technical Brief can be presented and discussed. Other technical briefs under development by the TAG include Emission Credits and Variance Provisions. The TAG is also working on several control technology technical briefs that will be provided to the CAC before their February 13th meeting that will address issues such as current technologies, cost estimate, and multi-pollutant approaches. The TAG work schedule should be useful in allowing the CAC to plan for TAG presentations at future meetings.

- A system needs to be established to verify that committee members have received critical documents.

A list is being prepared that identifies meeting by meeting the information that has been provided by DNR to the CAC. This document will be updated as documents are provided. The CAC will receive a copy of this list before their January 18th meeting.

- Isn't one of the purposes of the CAC to summarize and respond to comments?

I believe that it is important that the members of the committee are knowledgeable about the significant areas of concern and controversy that have been raised in public comment. The committee has previously been provided a list of significant written comments from businesses, utilities, environmental groups and other organizations and several of the comments are available as electronic files. Arrangements can be made for CAC members to get copies of the comments that they are interested in reviewing.

Secretary Bazzell is interested in receiving advice from the CAC on how best to address these areas in the proposed regulations that are controversial. An evaluation of public comments and identification of significant issues in those comments is an appropriate activity for the CAC. However, I believe that the priority issues effort that the CAC has performed has identified the majority of significant and controversial issues that appear in public comments.

A public comment summary and response document was not a task that the Secretary had envisioned for this group. The DNR as part of our regulatory responsibility will provide the Natural Resources Board a comment summary and response to comments. This will

be a public document that is part of a rule adoption package available one month before the Natural Resources Board meeting would consider rule adoption.

- Consider adding a health professional knowledgeable in mercury effects to the Technical Advisory Group.

The TAG is not working directly on mercury health issues. Their focus is on evaluating technical issues related to proposed regulations for mercury air emissions from Wisconsin sources. Several of the TAG members are knowledgeable about the national health assessments that have been performed however evaluating issues concerning mercury health impacts was not a charge given to the group.